DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 652 JC 850 367

AUTHOR Sturtz, Alan J.
TITLE The Status of Planning at Community, Junior and Technical Colleges in the Northeast: Results of the Survey--August 1984.
INSTITUTION South Central Community Coll., New Haven, CT. Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Development.
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; *College Planning; *Community Colleges; Questionnaires; Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS United States (Northeast)

ABSTRACT

In summer 1984, a survey was conducted of 190 community, junior, and technical college presidents in 11 northeastern states regarding the status of planning at their institutions. The study sought institutional data and information on current and future planning efforts. Based on responses from 103 presidents, study findings revealed: (1) 79.6% of the respondents indicated that they had an institutional plan and, of these, 84% had a planning committee; (2) 53 of the colleges had appointed planning committees with committee membership ranging from 3 to 30; (3) 69.5% of the colleges with plans used a 3-year planning period; and (4) 45 of the 82 colleges with plans included programs, facilities and personnel elements in their institutional plans. The survey instrument and staff titles of planning officers are appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258652

THE STATUS OF PLANNING AT COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES IN THE NORTHEAST:

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY--AUGUST 1984

Alan J. Sturtz, Director

Office of Institutional Research,
Planning and Development

SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
New Haven, Connecticut

January 1985

JC 850 367

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.J. Sturtz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE STATUS OF PLANNING AT COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES IN THE NORTHEAST*

Alan J. Sturtz
Director, Institutional Research, Planning and Development
South Central Community College
New Haven, Connecticut

Introduction

During the summer of 1984, 190 community, junior and technical college presidents in the eleven state region of the Northeast Association for Institutional Research (NEAIR) were surveyed regarding the status of planning at their institutions (see Appendix A). The 103 usable responses represented a return rate of 54.2% from this single mailing. Table 1 shows the return rate by state.

Table 1. Return rate by state.

STATE	# OF INSTITUTIONS	RESPONSES	% RETURN
Connecticut	19	13	68.4
Delaware	2	1	50.0
Maryland	18	9	50.0
Massachusetts	31	17	54.8
Maine	8	4	50.0
New Hampshire	8	2	25.0
New Jersey	19	9	47.4
New York	54	33	61.1
Pennsylvania	26	11	42.3
Rhode Island	1	1	100.0
Vermont	4	3	75.0
TOTAL	190	103	54.2%

* Part of a presentation at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the NorthEast Association for Institutional Research, Albany, New York, October 1984.

Table 2 presents in tablular form selected responses by state for affiliation, the development of an institutional plan, and whether there is a planning officer or planning committee. As an overall summary, of the presidents who responded, 84% were from public institutions; 80% have institutional plans; 59% have a staff member who serves as a planning officer; and 69% have a planning committee. FTE enrollment at all responding institutions ranged from a low of 90 to a high of 15,045 with a median of 1,850. 27.5% of the responding institutions had FTE enrollment of less than 1,000; 35.1 % had enrollment between 1,000 and 2,500; 19.2% had enrollment between 2,500 and 5,000; and 18.2% had FTE enrollment over 5,000.

Table 2. Responses to Selected Items by State:
All Respondents

STATE	NUMBER	HAVE PLAN		AFFILIATION		PLANNING OFFICER		PLANNING COMMITTEE	
		#	%	Pub(%)	Ind(%)	#	%	#	%
CT	13	9	69	85	15	6	46	8	62
DE	1	1	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
MD	9	8	89	100	0	8	89	5	56
MA	17	16	94	71	29	12	71	13	87
ME	4	2	50	100	0	0	0	1	25
NH	2	2	100	100	0	0	0	2	100
NJ	9	9	100	100	0	8	89	7	78
NY	33	26	79	32	18	18	55	26	79
PA	11	9	82	73	27	8	73	8	73
RI	1	0	0	100	0	1	100	1	100
VT	3	0	0	67	33	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	103	82	80%	84%	16%	61	59%	71	69%

Institutional Plans

Eighty-two (79.6%) of the presidents responding (in nine of the eleven states) indicated that they had an institutional plan: seventy (85.4%) were from public colleges, twelve (14.6 %) were from independent colleges (in four of the eleven states). The FTE enrollment for colleges with long-range plans ranged from 180 to 14,977, with a median enrollment of 2,700 FTE.

Table 3. Responses to Selected Items by State: Institutions with Long-Range Plans

STATE	NUMBER	AFFILIATION		PLANNING OFFICER		PLANNING COMMITTEE	
		Pub(%)	Ind(%)	#	%	#	%
CT	9	78	22	6	67	8	89
DE	1	100	0	0	0	0	0
MD	8	100	0	7	88	5	63
MA	16	75	25	12	75	13	81
ME	2	100	0	0	0	1	50
NH	2	100	0	0	0	2	100
NJ	9	100	0	8	89	7	78
NY	26	85	15	17	65	24	92
PA	9	78	22	8	89	9	100
TOTAL	82	85%	15%	58	71%	69	84%

Fifty-eight (70.7%) of the respondents with institutional plans also had a staff member who served as a planning officer; twenty-four had no such staff position (see Appendix B). Sixty-nine presidents (84.1%) indicated that their institutions had a planning committee; twelve indicated no committee and one did not respond to the question.

When asked to describe the committee selection process, fifty-three (64.6%) noted that the committee was appointed; ten indicated that the committee was comprised of both appointed and elected staff; three campuses have an elected planning committee, one has a volunteer system. The number of members of the planning committees ranges from 3 to 30. (Twenty-five presidents indicated that there was no fixed membership or did not answer the question; two responded that the planning committee was a committee of the Board of Trustees.) The most common committee size was twelve (10 colleges); five colleges each had seven, eight or nine member committees; four colleges each had ten or eleven member committees.

Fifty-three colleges (64.6%) have at least one administrator on the planning committee: most committees had two (12 colleges), followed by three/four/five (7 colleges each), and six and seven administrators (5 colleges). Forty-six colleges (56.1%) have at least one faculty member on the committee: 12 colleges have four; 10 colleges have two; 7 colleges have five; 5 colleges have three; and two colleges have planning committees with 12 faculty members serving. Thirty-four colleges (41.5%) have at least one other member of the professional staff serving on the planning committee; eighteen colleges (22.0%) have at least one classified staff member on the committee; and twenty-six colleges (32.9%) have at least one student serving on the planning committee.

Seven out of ten institutions that have plans (55/69.5%) use three-year planning periods; fourteen colleges have two year

planning periods and eight colleges have a longer than three-year planning cycle (most indicated five years).

Forty-five of the eighty-two colleges with plans include programs, facilities and personnel elements in their institutional plans; eleven include only programs and facilities elements, three include program and personnel elements; three include only programs; one each includes facilities or personnel; and seventeen include the three elements listed and also such concerns as development, student services, admissions/enrollment, budget, and community relations.

No Institutional Plan

Twenty-one (20.4%) of the presidents responding to the survey indicated that they had no institutional plan. They represent sixteen public and five independent colleges in eight of the eleven states surveyed.

[Even though there was no institutional plan, three respondents indicated that they did have a staff member who served as a planning officer and three indicated that their institution had a planning committee (two committees were appointed; the third institution provided no response.)]

Table 4. Responses to Selected Items by State:
Institutions with No Long-Range Plans

STATE	NUMBER	AFFILIATION		PLANNING OFFICER		PLANNING COMMITTEE	
		Pub(%)	Ind(%)	#	%	#	%
CT	4	100	0	0	0	0	0
MD	1	100	0	1	100	0	0
MA	1	0	100	0	0	0	0
ME	2	100	0	0	0	0	0
NY	7	71	29	1	14	2	29
PA	2	50	50	0	0	0	0
RI	1	100	0	1	100	1	100
VT	3	67	33	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	21	76%	24%	3	14%	3	14%

Most of the institutions in the No Plan category do intend to correct that status: fifteen anticipate the formulation of a planning process within one year; two anticipate a process within three years. One college anticipates that formulation of a planning process will take longer than three years and three colleges do not anticipate the formulation of a planning process.

APPENDIX A

FACSIMILE OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PLANNING AS A PARTICIPATIVE PROCESS
A survey to determine the extent of planning at community, junior and technical colleges in the Northeast

SECTION 1: INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

State in which your college is located _____
Affiliation: (Public or Independent) _____
Fall 1983 FTE Enrollment _____
Number of Professional Staff _____
Number of Classified Staff _____
Does your college have an Institutional Plan _____
(If YES, please answer the questions in SECTION 2; if NO, please answer the question in SECTION 3)

SECTION 2: INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Does your institution have a staff member who serves as a planning officer? _____
If YES, please give TITLE _____

Does your institution have a Planning Committee? _____

If YES, is it APPOINTED or ELECTED _____
Number of members _____
Administrators _____
Faculty _____
Other Professional Staff _____
Classified Staff _____
Students _____

What time period does the Plan cover: _____
(a) one year; (b) three years; (c) five years; (d) other

What elements does the Plan cover: _____
(a) programs (b) facilities (c) personnel (d) a and b: (e) a and c
(f) b and c (g) a, b and c (h) additional areas: PLEASE LIST

_____
_____

Describe briefly how the plan is developed (Use the back of this page if necessary).

SECTION 3: FUTURE PLANNING EFFORTS

Do you anticipate the formulation of a planning process _____
(a) within one year (b) within three years (c) longer than three years;
(d) do not anticipate the formulation of a planning process

Please return this form in the enclosed envelope to Dr. Alan J. Sturtz, Director of Institutional Research, Planning and Development, South Central Community College, 60 Sargent Drive, New Haven, CT 06511.

APPENDIX B

PLANNING OFFICERS

Based on the survey responses, the following table presents the titles of staff members who serve as planning officers at the different campuses.

TITLE	NUMBER	PERCENT
(Institutions With Plans)	58	
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING (+)	29	50.0
(+)		
(Inst) Research	15	
Development	6	
Management	3	
Budget	1	
Facilities	1	
Human Resources	1	
Information Services	1	
Planning	1	
Director (Inst) Research/Devmt	9	15.5
President	4	6.9
Academic Dean	3	5.2
Assistant to the President	3	5.2
Executive Dean (of the College)	3	5.2
VP/Dean/Dir Inst Devmt/Advancemt	3	5.2
Administrative Dean	2	3.4
Director Fiscal Operations	1	1.7
Director Institutional Services	1	1.7
(Institutions Without Plans)	3	
Assistant to the President	3	100.0

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
AUG 16 1985